United Nations A/C.2/61/SR.32

General Assembly
Sixty-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General
14 December 2006

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 32nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 1 December 2006, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms. Intelmann ..... (Estonia)

Contents

Agenda item 42: Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)

Agenda item 51: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*)

(d) Commodities (*continued*)

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 55: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) International migration and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance of the United Nations, including special economic assistance (*continued*)

(b) Special economic assistance to individual countries or regions (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

06-63699 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

Agenda item 42: Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.46/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the proclamation of international years

1. **Mr. Bialek** (Australia) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.46/Rev.1 on behalf of the original sponsors and Andorra, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Poland, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

2. **The Chairperson** announced that Austria, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Moldova, Monaco, Norway and Serbia also wished to join in sponsoring the draft resolution.

3. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.46/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Agenda item 51: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.14)

Draft resolution on international trade and development

4. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.14, which had no programme budget implications. She informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested.

5. **Mr. Le Roux** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the draft resolution that had been submitted for negotiation had sent a strong signal to the World Trade Organization (WTO) on the importance of resuming negotiations. The Group had drafted the text in such a way as to maintain all the issues contained in the Doha Declaration, while deliberately avoiding specific issues that were pertinent to the current negotiations in Geneva. The Group had thought that, by keeping the draft resolution general in nature, it would have been possible to reach consensus sooner.

6. The Group was extremely disappointed that it had not been possible to reach consensus. However, it believed that the draft resolution as it stood still sent a very strong signal on the need to resume the Doha Round and implement the original mandate of the Doha Declaration, so as to ensure that the development dimension was addressed as soon as possible.

7. **Mr. Tarragô** (Brazil), speaking on behalf of the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR), said that it was regrettable that, for the third consecutive year, the Committee had been unable to reach a consensus on the international trade and development resolution. It was once again disappointing that delegations had not shown the necessary vision to seize the opportunity to send a message of unity regarding the Doha Development Round.

8. The stalemate in the Doha Round was a cause for serious concern, particularly for WTO members. The United Nations could have helped to create an environment conducive to the resumption of WTO negotiations so that the long-overdue promises of a truly development-oriented multilateral trading system could finally be kept, in line with the statements made by world leaders at various international forums. Instead, by adopting the draft resolution by a vote, the Committee would be sending the message that it was divided, with some countries being committed to the Doha Round and others, perhaps, having second thoughts.

9. The single most important trade and development challenge was currently to put the negotiations back on track. Differences, while wide, should not be irreconcilable. All WTO members recognized that everyone could derive great benefits from an equitable and reinforced multilateral trading system. Political will and a constructive spirit were essential for the successful conclusion of the Doha Round. MERCOSUR regretted that delegations had been unable to show sufficient flexibility and commitment to overcome the obstacles preventing a consensus.

10. **Mr. Rosengren** (Finland), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting and on behalf of the European Union; the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Iceland, Moldova and Ukraine, said that the countries concerned would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.14.

11. The European Union was disappointed about the outcome of consultations. While appreciating the considerable effort made by all the parties, it regretted

that it had not been possible to reach agreement and send a consensual message on the resumption of the Doha Development Agenda negotiations. It was in the interest of all States to send such a message, along with a clear recognition of the benefits of a successful conclusion of the Doha Round.

12. The European Union remained fully committed to the Doha Development Agenda, which continued to be the central priority of its trade policy, and to open markets, progressive trade liberalization and stronger multilateral rules. In that spirit, it would continue to work with all its WTO partners for a successful outcome of the Doha Round. All WTO members have a shared responsibility in the Doha Round, to which they should all contribute in accordance with their means. The European Union fully agreed that developing countries should do less than developed countries. Nevertheless, emerging economies should also open their markets, not least to increase South-South trade and in favour of the least developed countries, although the European Union could accept that the poorest developing countries made no, or very few, market opening commitments. However, the Doha Development Agenda remained a common endeavour of all WTO members, not a one-way street.

13. He would not mention all the elements of the draft resolution that were unacceptable to the European Union, but underlined that the draft resolution was unbalanced overall. In particular, the European Union could not agree with the singling-out of agriculture. The Doha Development Agenda did not concern only agriculture. Economic analyses had shown that industrial goods, services and rules, together with agriculture, were key to growth and development. To ignore or underplay other areas was wrong and did not reflect the broad and balanced Doha Development Agenda to which all States had agreed.

14. On other issues of interest for developing countries, such as action on Aid for Trade and duty-free and quota-free market access for the least developed countries' products, the draft did not reflect all the efforts made during consultations to reach consensual language. The European Union regretted that missed opportunity, since it remained committed to a significant development package.

15. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that the United States was a leading advocate of trade liberalization. It had made bold proposals for ambitious results the previous year in Hong Kong and had recently presented a formula for balanced moves by the major trading countries, both developed and developing, that could put States on the path to achieving a successful Doha Round.

16. A successful Doha Round would impact on development, poverty eradication and the further integration of developing countries into the multilateral trading system. His delegation had hoped that the resolution would encourage progress on the Doha Development Agenda. It had negotiated in good faith and seen progress, and had therefore been disappointed when the Group of 77 and China had chosen to submit their original draft, rather than the version under negotiation. His delegation supported some elements of the current draft, but also noted several attempts to dictate the terms of resumption and the terms of the outcome of WTO negotiations. It would therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.14.

17. **Mr. Maksimychev** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.14. A decision on such an important matter that came under the Committee's jurisdiction should be taken by consensus. In his view, the Committee had not exhausted all the possibilities for consensus. He hoped that in the future the Committee would revert to its practice of adopting resolutions on international trade and development by consensus.

18. **Mr. Yun** Kang-hyeon (Republic of Korea) said that trade was the most efficient tool for poverty eradication and sustainable development. Special attention should therefore be paid to the development aspect during discussions about the international trade system.

19. The draft resolution did not accurately reflect the state of the Doha negotiations. To successfully conclude the talks, the interests of all participants should be taken into account in the procedures and in the final outcome in a balanced manner, across all agenda items. The draft before the Committee did not reflect that approach.

20. It was important to convey a strong and concerted request for an early resumption and a successful conclusion of negotiations. In that regard, it was regrettable that it was necessary to proceed to a vote. His delegation was eager for an early resumption of negotiations and was hoping for an ambitious and

balanced outcome, as originally agreed at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference, held in Doha in 2001. To that end, States must work out a meaningful and balanced package while properly addressing the development dimension. The text before the Committee did not fulfil those expectations. The Republic of Korea would therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.14.

21. **Mr. Bialek** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of New Zealand, expressed disappointment that Member States had been unable to achieve consensus on the draft resolution, particularly at such a critical juncture in the Doha Round. The draft resolution as proposed did not significantly move the Doha negotiations forward and understated the important role played by the global rules-based trading system in reinforcing economic growth and development. The rules-based multilateral trading regime, as enshrined in WTO agreements, contributed greatly to global prosperity, poverty elimination and sustainable development.

22. The development dividend being sought by the draft resolution's proponents was most likely to come from improved market access in agriculture. An ambitious outcome on agriculture was critical if WTO was to fulfil its development promises. To break the current impasse, all WTO members would need to demonstrate flexibility and political will, and work towards achieving a balanced and ambitious outcome beneficial to all WTO members. The strongly worded statement on multilateral trade recently issued by Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders in Hanoi emphasized where efforts should be concentrated.

23. **Ms. Brown** (Canada) said that over the past few weeks her delegation had worked with others to achieve consensus on the draft resolution. It had seemed that States had been making constructive progress and that, in that spirit, delegations were willing to continue their negotiations. It was regrettable, then, that the Group of 77 and China had ended discussions and instead put forward a text that fell short of the desired goal.

24. Her delegation was disappointed with the draft resolution before the Committee and regretted that it had not been possible to agree on wording reflecting the need to support the Doha Round at such a critical time and the need for all major trading countries belonging to WTO to contribute to progress in the negotiations.

25. In various places, the text fell short of, or even misrepresented, commitments made elsewhere. In paragraph 6, regarding duty-free and quota-free access for the least developed countries, the wording was inconsistent with the agreement on that issue at the Sixth WTO Ministerial Conference, held in Hong Kong in 2005, and the fact that such agreement had been predicated on the outcome of the remainder of the WTO negotiations that comprised the single undertaking of the Doha Development Agenda. Canada was, and remained, a strong supporter of the least developed countries. Its market access initiative for the least developed countries, in effect since 2003, was one of the most far-reaching preference schemes of any developed country.

26. Paragraph 12 mistakenly gave the impression that the rules relating to Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) were inconsistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity. It had been Canada's long-standing position that there were no inconsistencies between the two and that both agreements could be implemented in a mutually supportive way.

27. Paragraphs 15 and 16 were also unacceptable, as they went far beyond the agreed text that had emerged from the recommendations of the WTO-related Task Forces on the Enhanced Integrated Framework for Trade-related Technical Assistance to Least Developed Countries and on the Aid for Trade Initiative.

28. Lastly, the references to "coercive economic measures" in paragraph 5 and "arbitrary and abusive use" in paragraph 9 were inappropriate.

29. For all those reasons, Canada would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.14.

30. **Mr. Ali** (Syrian Arab Republic) wished to know which delegation had requested a recorded vote.

31. **The Chairperson** said that the recorded vote had been requested by the United States.

32. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.14.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados,

Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.14 was adopted by 107 votes to 1, with 52 abstentions.*

34. **Ms. Nagahara** (Japan) said that Japan, believing that trade facilitation was of vital importance to developing countries, had participated constructively in the discussion on the draft resolution. It was, therefore, regrettable that the Committee had been unable to reach a consensus and that a text not properly reflecting the negotiations had been put forward. Developed and developing countries must together send a positive and balanced message for the early resumption and success of the Doha Round. Because the draft resolution in question did not send such a message, Japan had abstained in the vote.

35. However, Japan continued to support the trade facilitation and economic growth of developing countries through its Development Initiative, announced in December 2005, in which it expressed its commitment to provide duty-free and quota-free market access for essentially all products originating from all the least developed countries and to contribute to building infrastructure. Japan would make every effort to work towards the early resumption and conclusion of the Doha Round.

36. **Ms. Houngbedji** (Benin), speaking on behalf of all the least developed countries, noted that almost all the delegations that had explained their position had claimed to support and to have opened their markets to those countries. Unfortunately, when the time came to put that commitment in binding language in resolutions, those same delegations were reluctant. The primary objective, as reaffirmed in the Brussels Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries and in Doha and Hong Kong, was clearly to give market access to all the least developed countries and all their products. Until such time as the General Assembly could send a clear message in that regard, the least developed countries would stand ready to take any action that they could. The General Assembly, meanwhile, should be consistent in its actions when pursuing that message.

(d) Commodities (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.2 and L.52)

Draft resolutions on the International Year of Natural Fibres

37. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.52, which was being submitted by Ms. Gomes (Portugal), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.2. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

38. **Ms. Gomes** (Portugal), Rapporteur, orally corrected draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.52 as follows: the phrase "in accordance with the guidelines for international years and anniversaries as contained in the annex to Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/67" in paragraph 3 and the phrase "in accordance with the guidelines of the Economic and Social Council" in paragraph 4 should both be deleted.

39. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.52, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

40. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.2 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.16 and L.51)

Draft resolution on the International Year of Sanitation 2008

41. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.51, which was being submitted by Mr. Fonseca (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.16. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

42. **Mr. Elbakly** (Egypt) said that Barbados, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Cyprus, Denmark, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Mexico and Monaco had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

43. **The Chairperson** said that Angola, Austria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Burundi, Cambodia, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Eritrea, the Gambia, Grenada, Hungary, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Mongolia, Morocco, Peru, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, South Africa, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vietnam, Zambia and Zimbabwe also wished to join the sponsors.

44. **Mr. Fonseca** (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson, withdrew draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.51 and introduced the same text as draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.16/Rev.1. He hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

45. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted.*

46. **Mr. Kodera** (Japan) said that the timing of the resolution was significant: it had been adopted in the same year as the 2006 Human Development Report, which also focused on water and sanitation and called for a global partnership for action. He hoped that both documents would raise awareness about the lack of safe drinking water and basic sanitation and facilitate action at the local, national and international levels.

Agenda item 55: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) International migration and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.12 and L.47*)

Draft resolution on international migration and development

47. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.47*, which was being submitted by Mr. Barry (Senegal), Vice-Chairperson, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.12. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

48. **Mr. Barry** (Senegal), Vice-Chairperson, recommended the draft resolution to the Committee and expressed the hope that it would be adopted by consensus.

49. **Mr. Suárez Salvia** (Argentina) suggested changes to the Spanish translation of the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution: "*una iniciativa dirigida por los Estados*" should be moved to the end of the paragraph, and the word "*los*" should be deleted.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.47* was adopted.*

51. **Mr. Le Roux** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, expressed appreciation to the facilitator for his efforts in achieving consensus. In striving to meet internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals, it was necessary to take a focused approach to issues in order to reverse underdevelopment, poverty and skills flight. In particular, "brain drain" was an important issue to developing countries and continued to demand the Committee's attention.

52. Achieving the Millennium Development Goals was central to eradicating poverty and unemployment,

fostering sustainable development, reducing recourse to forced and irregular migration and thereby facilitating migration out of choice. Forced migration and its economic effects on host countries should be given due consideration, especially with regard to situations involving refugees and displaced persons that resulted from foreign occupation and armed hostilities, as no real development could take place in such situations.

53. He looked forward to a constructive debate on item 55 (b) during the sixty-third session of the General Assembly and, in particular, to a discussion of options for appropriate follow-up to the High-level Dialogue within the United Nations.

54. **Ms. Fernández** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, noted that, at the sixty-third session of the General Assembly, a constructive debate would be held on the developments following the High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development and welcomed the fact that follow-up to that Dialogue had already begun. In that connection, she drew attention to the EU-Africa Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development, which had been held that week in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. She especially looked forward to the Global Forum on Migration and Development to be held in Belgium in 2007. Lastly, she expressed her appreciation to the facilitator for his efforts in upholding the positive spirit of the High-level Dialogue throughout the intense negotiations on the resolution.

55. **Mr. Siregar** (Indonesia) expressed appreciation to all of the delegations involved in the negotiations on the resolution and congratulated the Committee on reaching consensus on such an important issue.

56. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.12 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 69: Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance of the United Nations, including special economic assistance (*continued*)

(b) Special economic assistance to individual countries or regions (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.10/Rev.2)

Draft resolution on international assistance for the economic rehabilitation of Angola

57. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.10/Rev.2, which was being submitted by Mr. Gaspar Martins (Angola), on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.10/Rev.1. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

58. **Mr. Gaspar Martins** (Angola) said that Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Finland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Suriname, Ukraine and Zambia should be added to the list of sponsors.

59. **The Chairperson** said that Afghanistan, Barbados, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chile, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominica, El Salvador, Eritrea, the Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, the Netherlands, the Niger, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors.

60. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.10/Rev.2 was adopted.*

61. **Mr. Gaspar Martins** (Angola) welcomed the resolution's emphasis on national ownership, recognizing Angola's leadership in the pursuit of sustainable economic growth and development; indeed, national ownership was vital to the success of any post-conflict process. He was therefore extremely grateful to all Member States for having achieved consensus on the resolution.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.